

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 93 14:49:30 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #192
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 16 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 192

Today's Topics:

 Blind VEs
 Childish posts on the NQ01 case: (2 msgs)
 Need to have your license in Minnesota (2 msgs)
 NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action (5 msgs)
 NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1993 10:59:48 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1vdn2p\$k37@thumper.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@thumper.cc.utexas.edu (The
Monster of Peladon) writes:

>Now to what you say about readers. You act as if the concept of readers and
>what they are was conceived simply for this argument. Not the case. As we've
>stated time and again, blind people have been using readers successfully for
>decades, and we've pretty much established what they are, aside from any logic
>games that anyone might wish to play. We've said that they are an extension of
>(when they are working) of the blind person, and so they are. This is not a
>*claim*, it is simple fact.

No matter how many times, or for how long, you repeat this claim, it's
still just a claim and not a fact. The information bandwidth of any
human information channel other than the visual is insufficient to

convey the uninterpreted visual information of the observer to a third party. Thus you are depending on the interpretation and judgement of the observer for the proctoring. You are not the proctoring agent. Someone, it may have been you, mentioned "seeing eye" dogs as an example. Again, it's the dog that's doing the observing, and it's the dog that's making the decisions. Would you follow just any stray dog across the street? Or would you demand a trained and certified guide dog? I submit that most people would want the certified guide dog, and so apparently does the FCC.

In the past, the FCC has demanded that the *operators* of stations as well as their employers be licensed. This under the theory that the operator is the one in immediate control of the situation, not the employer. Under pressure from the industry, the FCC has backed off from this requirement, and technical quality has suffered as a result. This is a parallel to allowing unlicensed proctors for the amateur exams. Your organization may be able to pressure the FCC into rescinding this requirement too, but playing word games doesn't lessen the fact that it's the observer who's doing the observing, not his employer.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1993 11:03:16 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1vloge\$65v@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon) writes:

>

>Gary:

>

> Tell you what. You can move next door to me, sure. Very happy to
>have you. I'll be moving myself and my pet skunks into your home soon
>after. I'll eat your food, drink your drinks, use your furnishings and
>make love to your wife. And by the way. I'm sure that you wouldn't mind
>me helping myself to what's in your wallet as well. And since I don't
>drive a car I'll be sure to sell yours quickly so that I can afford cab
>fare. After all. This *is* SOCIETY, and we have to work TOGETHER.

> That last paragraph was pretty darned ridiculous, wasn't it?

No, not really. I've met folks like you. We call them criminals, and down here we usually shoot them for trespassing.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 93 16:25:31 GMT

From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!noose.ecn.purdue.edu!en.ecn.purdue.edu!n9ljx@purdue.edu

Subject: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun16.110316.27557@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <1vloge\$65v@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon) writes:

>>

>>Gary:

>>

>> Tell you what. You can move next door to me, sure. Very happy to
>>have you. I'll be moving myself and my pet skunks into your home soon
>>after. I'll eat your food, drink your drinks, use your furnishings and
>>make love to your wife. And by the way. I'm sure that you wouldn't mind
>>me helping myself to what's in your wallet as well. And since I don't
>>drive a car I'll be sure to sell yours quickly so that I can afford cab
>>fare. After all. This *is* SOCIETY, and we have to work TOGETHER.

>> That last paragraph was pretty darned ridiculous, wasn't it?

>

>No, not really. I've met folks like you. We call them criminals, and

>down here we usually shoot them for trespassing.

>

>Gary

>--

>Gary Coffman KE4ZV		>You make it,		>gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
---------------------	--	---------------	--	---------------------------

Date: 16 Jun 1993 01:01:18 GMT

From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!post.its.mcw.edu!zazen!

news.uwsuper.edu!hp.uwsuper.edu!pmcgilla@ames.arpa

Subject: Need to have your license in Minnesota

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Tom Bodoh (tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov) wrote:
: In article <1993Jun8.124740.1@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com>,
estey@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com writes:
: |> In regard to Minnesota State law concerning the requirement for
: |> an Amateur to carry a copy of his license
: |>

On the other hand, I have a special use permit for Minnesota, issued by
Minnesota that says I can carry a 2-way police, or extended ham radio
in and out of the state. Only hitch is that it stays in that vehicle
with that license plate. The other half knows where said permit is if
she were to get stopped. She can listen all she wants as long as she
doesn't transmit.

--

Patrick L. McGillan
Computer Systems Specialist
University Of Wisconsin Ph: (715) 394-8191
Superior, Wisconsin pmcgilla@uwsuper.edu

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1993 19:48:04 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!
othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Need to have your license in Minnesota
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Mr. Patrick L. McGillan (pmcgilla@hp.uwsuper.edu) wrote:
: Tom Bodoh (tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov) wrote:
: : In article <1993Jun8.124740.1@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com>,
estey@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com writes:
: : |> In regard to Minnesota State law concerning the requirement for
: : |> an Amateur to carry a copy of his license
: : |>

: On the other hand, I have a special use permit for Minnesota, issued by
: Minnesota that says I can carry a 2-way police, or extended ham radio
: in and out of the state. Only hitch is that it stays in that vehicle
: with that license plate. The other half knows where said permit is if
: she were to get stopped. She can listen all she wants as long as she
: doesn't transmit.

Ok, I'll bite, how does one obtain one of these permits?

Dan
--

```

*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*

```

```

-----
Date: 16 Jun 1993 03:21:09 -0500
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!pagesat!netsys!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
usc!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-
mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

Now that some joking (or whatever this has been) has been done, let's talk about this issue seriously. I've been reading the various articles and I have a few thoughts on this subject.

I have to repeat my previous statement. I **still** feel that if one owns the property that one lives on, one should be able to do what one wishes with it, as long as such does no harm to others. Now that's a fairly open-ended statement, I realize. So I'll clarify. When I speak of "harm," I mean posing a physical danger or breaking some criminal statute or other.

In the case of amateur radio, I believe that people have to weigh the merits of their idea of visual esthetics against the possible lives and property that can be **saved** by the presence of that big tower. In a way I can understand Boulder County's attitude. The mountains West of Boulder are nothing short of stunning, and I recommend that **anyone** visit there for the scenic beauty. But I think that this laudible concept of protecting natural beauty has been taken just a shade too far. After all. We're not talking about a pig farm or a smokestack laden manufacturing facility here. Each amateur radio station has the potential for saving lives on a local, regional or even national basis.

If there is "blame" to be assumed here, I think that it can be shared. NQOI's neighbors should have been a bit more tolerant, Boulder County and the courts should have accommodated NQOI more, and NQOI should have checked for antenna restrictions before moving. Post-mortoms can be useful in helping us to realize mistakes that we've made, but they shouldn't be in my opinion, the crux of the argument here.

Rather we should put our brains to the task of figuring out how to avoid such

losses in the future. Organized amateur radio has made a mistake here, and I hope that we can recognize this and correct it before even more damage is done.

I like the idea that I read about amateur radio teaming up with the satellite dish makers for combined action on Capitol Hill. In fact I'd expand that to include wireless cable companies, and anyone else that would gain from a national antenna restriction exemption. I'm not talking about a conspiracy here, but an open coalition with a goal in mind. The national level is the best place in my view to concentrate a massive effort. If we keep fighting local battles that will deplete our resources, and we'll be fighting from now on. A decisive national law that would protect residential antenna users seems the wisest course. If you want things done, go to the Hill and lobby for them, just like everyone else.

And you don't have to be part of a bigtime lobbying firm to do this, either. I have gone to Washington for four straight years, and talked to congresspeople in conjunction with hundreds of other blind people. We aren't big D.C. wheeler-dealers, just ordinary people who go to D.C. every year, armed with a carefully thought-out agenda. congresspeople like to see us because they *want* to know what they can do for their constituents, and all the letters and phone calls in the world can't match personal visits by people from the old home state.

We get the results, too. Oh we don't get *everything* that we want to be sure, but we seem to come away every year with *some* sort of progress having been made. Other people can do the same thing. All it takes is a little determination and organization and you're on your way.

At the same time there is another course that can be followed. Public relations efforts on behalf of amateur radio should be stepped up on a nationwide scale. Perhaps NQOI's neighbors would have been more sympathetic to his needs, had they realized that regional stations and even stations across the country could be responsible for saving their lives. Yes, I know that they said that they could care less about NQOI's regional capability, but that's the whole point. They have no conception that local communications can very easily be wiped out. At that point it's up to stations with a wider scope to take over. I think we would lose far fewer court battles if the public recognized what we do, and the potential that lies in each station.

Now I realize that when I'm talking about massive nationwide PR campaigns I'm talking huge amounts of money. Where's that money going to come from? From amateurs, yes. But I don't think that our combined monetary outlay would be enough, especially when one considers that lots of amateurs out there are either poor like me, or are too apathetic to do anything. And that is where the coalition that I mentioned earlier could come in. Combined business and consumer interests could apply both power *and* wealth to the problem.

We'd have to be careful though, that the interests of amateur radio wouldn't get

lost in the shuffle. This is a danger of coalitions, but if we're watchful I don't see how these difficulties could arise.

The way I see it we're faced with two choices. We can either sit back and let these neighborhood associations and restrictive regulations eat away at our hobby, or we can do something about it before things get too far out of hand.

73 to All!

--
David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will *NEVER* go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 93 16:56:32 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@ames.arpa
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1vml5l\$a1j@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon) writes:

>The way I see it we're faced with two choices. We can either sit back and let
>these neighborhood associations and restrictive regulations eat away at our
>hobby, or we can do something about it before things get too far out of hand.
Actually, you've forgotten choice number zero, which is:

0. Never use the law to solve a technical problem.

After all, the root problem is how to build an efficient radiator, right?
We're better off putting out energy and money into the development of low
visibility antenna systems, because the probability of success is much higher,
and the number of people ticked off by such an effort would be lower.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1993 21:11:27 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1vml5l\$a1j@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster
>of Peladon) writes>>The way I see it we're faced with two choices. We can either
>sit back and let
>>these neighborhood associations and restrictive regulations eat away at our
>>hobby, or we can do something about it before things get too far out of hand.
>Actually, you've forgotten choice number zero, which is:
>
>0. Never use the law to solve a technical problem.
>
>After all, the root problem is how to build an efficient radiator, right?
>We're better off putting out energy and money into the development of low
>visibility antenna systems, because the probability of success is much higher,
>and the number of people ticked off by such an effort would be lower.

Well as one embroiled in such a fight, I can tell you that technology has little to do with it. In my situation the biggest concerns are EMI and aesthetics. Technology "may" be able to help the aesthetics, although being an avid VHF/UHF DXer leaves me little hope that we're going to beat the laws of physics sufficiently through our technological advances that will allow me to reasonably work terrestrial DX with an unobtrusive low to the ground antenna. Even if such a miracle antenna exists, it certainly won't help alleviate the EMI problems my neighbors are experiencing. And my neighbors don't want *any* antennas, so I'm not sure how technology is going to solve that problem.

In my case, the EMI problem needs to be fought in Washington and perhaps the press and schools. Consumer electronics manufacturers are causing the problems, yet amateurs are the ones taking it on the chin. I don't pretend to have the resources of the manufacturer's lobbyists (sp?), but there are over 600,000 of us in the U.S. We *should* be able to make a difference.

I don't necessarily agree with the original poster that we can justify our antennas on emergency communication, but believe that we should be seeking other means to prevent the extinction of amateur radio in urban areas. Unless everyone is happy to define amateur radio as 2 meter FM :-(

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 93 20:10:54 GMT
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun16.191120.29322@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>Well as one embroiled in such a fight, I can tell you that technology has
>little to do with it. In my situation the biggest concerns are EMI and
>aesthetics.

Yes, but visibility has **everything** to do with it. Aside from the aesthetics, a tower unfortunately means "scapegoat" for any RFI complaints in the neighborhood. Not to mention the Broderites ("you're irradiating my children!").

VHF DX is another domain entirely. For some modes, you just can't get around the height requirement. For others (Sporadic E, Meteor, EME, Satellites), less so. At least the antennas are physically smaller for a given gain.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1993 20:02:58 GMT

From: csus.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Paul Flaherty (paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu) wrote:

: In article <1vml5l\$a1j@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon) writes:

: >The way I see it we're faced with two choices. We can either sit back and let
: >these neighborhood associations and restrictive regulations eat away at our
: >hobby, or we can do something about it before things get too far out of hand.
: Actually, you've forgotten choice number zero, which is:

: 0. Never use the law to solve a technical problem.

I thought this was a legal problem. Isn't that why we needed PRB-1 to begin with, to fight anti-antenna laws? It should be the municipalities or neighborhood association responsibility to prove that the changes they have been trying to make to our rights to build on our own property are not going to harm our ability to communicate.

: After all, the root problem is how to build an efficient radiator, right?
: We're better off putting out energy and money into the development of low
: visibility antenna systems, because the probability of success is much higher,
: and the number of people ticked off by such an effort would be lower.

If we start losing large quantities of spectrum are we to just shrug off the loss and try to devise more efficient modulation techniques instead of fighting for what we have been the stewards of for so long?

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: 16 Jun 1993 03:01:57 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

raichel@HAN.Paramax.COM (Alan J. Raichel) writes:

> re: Restrictive covenants - telling what you can and cannot do with your
> property and the effect on amateur radio.
>

[stuff deleted]

> Some examples of some of the more absurd covenants some coworkers
> say they have on their homes:
>
> - No cars parked in driveway - ALL cars MUST be in garage, and door closed.
> - No lawn decorations - flag poles, lawn jockies, bird baths...
> - No rust stains on driveways.
> - No pickup trucks parked outside - must be in garage - if you have one.
> - Limitations on what types of plants and trees that can be planted.

Well. Cars parked in driveways could hurt my property values.
Lawn jockies and bird baths, too. And, pickup trucks... enough said.
And besides, no one really NEEDS these things, do they?

:-) :-)

Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY / (719) 590-3230

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1993 16:49:10 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!steve@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun11.091749.25139@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> I wishh
> the ARRL would help fund several "ideal" cases and help put some good
> case law on the books. Most people don't have the funds to mount a
> good legal defense and as such, the rulings aren't necessarily in our
> favor, yet they impact everyone.
>
> 73,
> Todd
> N9MWB

The simple fact is that the league doesn't have sufficient funds for such and undertaking either.... in fact there is a standing Board order to NOT fund any such cases simply because they initially did try this and the cost got prohibitive real quick. Then there is the significant problem of selecting which case is "IDEAL." Every Tom, Dick and Harriet with a problem is going to be absolutely SURE that their case is the ground breaking situation. In summary..as one BOD member told me..we'll be glad to do this for the membership...but the dues will have to upto \$300 a year.

Steve KA6S

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1993 21:11:39 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

steve@netcom.com (Steven Wilson) writes:

>In article <1993Jun11.091749.25139@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little)>> I wishh
>> the ARRL would help fund several "ideal" cases and help put some good
>> case law on the books. Most people don't have the funds to mount a
>> good legal defense and as such, the rulings aren't necessarily in our
>> favor, yet they impact everyone.

>The simple fact is that the league doesn't have sufficient funds for such
>and undertaking either.... in fact there is a standing Board order to
>NOT fund any such cases simply because they initially did try this and
>the cost got prohibitive real quick. Then there is the significant
>problem of selecting which case is "IDEAL." Every Tom, Dick and
>Harriet with a problem is going to be absolutely SURE that their
>case is the ground breaking situation. In summary..as one BOD
>member told me..we'll be glad to do this for the membership...but
>the dues will have to upto \$300 a year.

Well then I guess we're in pretty deep doodoo. I sense that frequency allocation and antenna restrictions are the two most significant threats to amateur radio in the U.S. If you're telling me that the organization that claims to represent the U.S. amateur population can do nothing more than hand out advice and suggestions on antenna restrictions, then I question its priorities. The ARRL, AMSAT, and the amateur population in the U.S. is going to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on Phase 3D, yet I'm sure less than 1% of the amateurs represented will ever make use of 3D. There are surely less than 60,000 U.S. amateurs using OSCARs right now. Certainly more than 1% of amateurs are affected by antenna restrictions. Sure it's great publicity, in line with the purpose of the amateur radio service, etc. but is it judicious use of our resources? Where are the priorities here? (By the by, I support the ARRL, AMSAT, Phase 3D, etc., and may even get *back* on OSCAR if I can get my antennas back up.)

If Chris Imlay and the rest of the legal consultants at the ARRL can't find some "ideal" cases to try, then something is amiss. I hear time and time again about what cases are *not* "ideal", so someone must have an idea of what *is* "ideal" Lawyers get paid to figure out what cases are worth trying and make good case law. The more case law that gets on the books at this date over questionable cases, the more the rest of us have to "undo". I don't know enough about NQ0I to tell whether that was a good case or not, but the recent ruling is certainly going to hurt a great many of us.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: (null)
From: (null)
--sas
--

Scott Stambaugh - N9LJX
Operations Supervisor, ADPC
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1061

internet: n9ljx@ecn.purdue.edu
phone: 317 494 7946

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #192
